III. REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 10, 15, 17, 20, and 21 have been amended, and no claims have been cancelled. Applicants are not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments are only for facilitating expeditious allowance of the claimed subject matter. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuation and/or divisional patent applications. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

With respect to the amendments noted above, Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 10 herein to provide improved clarity, adding the feature of "after classifying the message at the client, sending the message to the server based on the message classification..." (claim 1, lines 6-7, and similarly recited in claim 10, line 8). Support for this amendment may be found in the specification as filed in at least paragraph [0032], lines 1-2; as well as impliedly in claims 1, 10, 15, and 20 as previously presented. Claims 15 and 20 have also been amended to provide improved clarity, reciting the feature of "a classification system for classifying messages at a client, wherein a classification of a message determines how the message is routed for processing at a server" (claim 15, line 4; and similarly recited in claim 20, lines 6-7), support for which can be found in the specification as filed in at least paragraph [0024], line 4, and FIG. 1 (including classification system 38, which is clearly located on client 26). Claims 17 and 21 have also been amended to recite in relevant part, "classifying messages [[on]] at a client," which merely provides improved clarity.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 6, 10, 13-18, and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Harding (US Pat. No. 7,200,636, hereinafter,

"Harding"); and claims 5, 7-9, 11-12, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Harding in view of Ogimoto *et al.* (US Pat. No. 6,032,205, hereinafter, "Ogimoto"). Applicants submit that Harding alone, and the combination of Harding and Ogimoto, respectively, do not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections accordingly.

With regard to the feature of "providing a message on the client to be sent to a server" (claim 1, line 4), Applicants submit that Harding does not anticipate this feature as asserted in the Office Action (p. 3). At col. 4, lines 1-3, Harding teaches the use of a pseudo-client 112, which includes data store 114, storing personalized rules for handling email messages for users. These personalized rules are applied by rules enforcement engine 208 to mail servers 108-110 (*id.*, col. 4, lines 25-26) using standard mail protocols such as POP3 and IMAP4 (*id.*, lines 26-33). The personalized rules are then used to create a lookup structure, such as a hash table (*id.*, lines 62-63), which is used to apply actions associated with the personalized rules *to email messages received by email server 108* for user 101 (*id.*, col. 5, lines 1-3; FIG. 3, step 308). Therefore, Harding's personalized rules do not anticipate "providing a message *on the client to be sent to a server*," as they are in fact used to handle and apply actions to email messages received on a server for subsequent access by a user on a client (104, 105, 106; *see* Harding FIG. 1).

With respect to the feature of "*classifying the message at the client* based on the set of rules" (claim 1, line 5 (emphasis added); and similarly recited in claim 10, line 6; claim 15, line 4; and claim 20, line 6), Applicants submit that Harding does not teach this feature. As discussed above, Harding's personalized rules are applied to incoming "email messages received for user 101 by e-mail server 108" (*id.*, col. 5, lines 2-3). Thus, Harding's email messages are classified

(as "unwanted" messages [Harding, col. 5, line 34, 39] or "possible junk" messages [*id.*, line 23, 40]) on the server – not *at the client* as claimed.

With respect to the feature of "after classifying the message at the client, sending the message to the server based on the message classification, wherein the message classification determines how the message is routed for processing at the server" (claim 1, lines 6-8; and similarly recited in claim 10, line 8), Applicants further submit that this feature is not taught by Harding. Initially, Applicants note that because, as discussed above, Harding does not classify messages at the client, it is not possible for Harding to teach "after classifying the message at the client, sending..." Applicants also submit that Harding does not teach "sending the message to the server based on the message classification, wherein the message classification determines how the message is routed for processing at the server." Harding instead teaches classification at the *server*, for transmission to the client -- the opposite of the claimed method of communicating over a network. Further, the classification of Harding's messages is the *result* of processing at the server; the classification does not *determine how the message is routed* for *processing at the server.*

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that Harding does not teach each and every feature of the invention claimed in the instant application. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 10, 15, and 20 under § 102(e) is therefore respectfully requested.

With respect to the rejection of dependent claim 5 under § 103(a), Applicants respectfully submit Harding and Ogimoto do not teach the feature recited therein. Specifically, claim 5 recites the "method of claim 1, further comprising adjusting a communications protocol port for the message based on the classification prior to the sending step." Ogimoto, on which the Office relies to teach the feature of the recited port, teaches "a request adjustment circuit 35

corresponding to the output port "0" is correspondingly arranged for every input ports "0" to "3", i.e. in correspondence with the request issuing circuits 31 and 34…" (Ogimoto, col. 4, lines 27-30.) Thus, Ogimoto's teachings pertain to adjustment of physical input and output ports, rather than *communications protocol ports* as recited herein. Because Ogimoto's physical ports are not relevant to the communications protocol ports, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject matter recited in claim 5 is not obvious.

With respect to dependent claims 2-4, 6-9, 11-14, 16-19, and 21-22, and with further respect to claim 5, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable for reasons stated above relative to independent claims 1, 10, 15, and 20, as well as for their own additional claimed subject matter. Further, with respect to claims 5, 7-9, 11-12, and 19, Applicants submit that Ogimoto does not cure the defects in the rejections discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a) to claims 2-9, 11-14, 16-19, and 21-22.

IV.   CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the Application as presented is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is necessary in order to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jayme M. Torelli/
Jayme M. Torelli
Reg. No.: 62,735

Date: October 1, 2008

Hoffman Warnick LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
Phone: (518) 449-0044
Fax: (518) 449-0047